



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,758	01/27/2004	Robert Jensen	021751-000710US	2259
68218 7590 02/20/2008 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP/PIXAR TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			EXAMINER PHAM, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/20/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/766,758

Applicant(s)

JENSEN ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL D. PHAM

Art Unit

2167

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MICHAEL D. PHAM.

(3) Andrew Lee (reg. 60371).

(2) Cam Y Truong.

(4) Bart Sullivan and Robert Jensen.

Date of Interview: 12 February 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Benson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' discussed the invention with respect to claim 1. Applicant's mainly asserted what was on the agenda. No agreement was reached. Applicant's were advised to submit a formal response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

TOWNSEND
and
TOWNSEND
and
CREW
LLP

San Francisco, California
Tel 415 576-0200

Walnut Creek, California
Tel 925 472-5000

San Diego, California
Tel 658 350-8100

Denver, Colorado
Tel 303 571-4000

Seattle, Washington
Tel 206 467-9600

Washington, DC
Tel 202 481-9900

Tokyo, Japan
Tel +81 3 3507-5809

Palo Alto

379 Lytton Avenue
Palo Alto
California 94301-1431
Tel 650-326-2400
Fax 650-326-2422

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

Date: February 07, 2008	Client & Matter Number: 021751-000710US	No. Pages (including this one): 4
To: Michael Pham United State Patent and Trademark Office	At Fax Number: 571-273-3924	Confirmation Phone Number:
From: Andrew J. Lee		(3778)

Message: Please see the following Informal Communication

Original Will:	<input type="checkbox"/> BE SENT BY MAIL	<input type="checkbox"/> BE SENT BY FEDEX/OVERNIGHT COURIER	<input type="checkbox"/> BE SENT BY MESSENGER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOT BE SENT
----------------	--	---	---	---

Faxed: Return to: Teri M. Muir - (5221)

If you have problems with reception please call Fax Services at extension 5537

Important

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure by applicable law or court order. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

61279085 v1

Informal Communication

To: Examiner Michael Pham
Fax: 571-273-3924

From: Andrew Lee (Reg. No. 60,371), 650-324-6351
Townsend and Townsend and Crew LLP

Date: February 7, 2008

Re: Application No. 10/766,758 filed January 27, 2004
Proposed Agenda for Interview Scheduled for February 12, 2008,
11:00AM PST (2:00PM EST)

Examiner Pham:

Please find below an outline of the points I propose to discuss in an interview for the above referenced application.

I. Section 103(a) Rejection of Independent Claim 1

A. Features of the present invention

1. Embodiments of the present invention provide techniques for building computer graphics models that incorporate shared components
2. One aspect of the present invention is the definition of public and private attributes for a shared component
 - a) A public attribute is an attribute of the shared component whose value may be overridden by users (e.g., modelers) that reference the shared component in a model
 - b) A private attribute is an attribute of the shared component whose value cannot be changed by users that reference the shared component in a model
3. In one set of embodiments, information identifying the public and private attributes of a shared component (*i.e.*, which attributes are public and which attributes are private) is included as part of the specification of the shared component

61278708 v1

To: Examiner Michael Pham
Fax: 571-273-3924
From: Andrew Lee (Reg. No. 60,371), 650-324-6351

February 7, 2008
Page 2

- a) In this manner, a creator of the shared component may control how downstream users use the shared component in their models

B. Distinguishing features of claim 1, as amended, over Szabo (U.S. Patent No. 6,768,486) in view of Benson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,516)

1. Claim 1 recites, in part "receiving a second file in response to the reference to the second object, the second file including a specification of the second object, the specification of the second object including information identifying . . . a plurality of private attributes of the second object" wherein "values for the plurality of private attributes of the second object cannot be modified by users of the first file."
2. The Office Action mailed November 11, 2007 concedes that Szabo fails to teach the above-recited feature.
3. However, the Office Action goes on to assert that this feature is shown in Benson because Benson allegedly discloses a component object system in which data objects may include public keys and private keys. (Office Action: pgs. 6-7). Thus, the Office Action apparently construes the public keys of Benson as reading on the public attributes recited in claim 1, and private keys of Benson as reading on the private attributes recited in claim 1.
 - a) Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, Applicants submit that the private keys of Benson do not correspond to the private attributes of claim 1. As described in Benson, each data object includes a signature list comprising one or more digital signatures. Each digital signature is created through the use of a hash function and a private key. (Benson: col. 4, line 62 – col. 5 line 3). Thus, at best, the private keys of Benson are merely mechanisms for generating a digital signature for a data object. The private keys do not constitute attributes of the data object that are locked from further modification based their "private" status.
 - b) Accordingly, Benson fails to teach or suggest wherein "values for the plurality of private attributes of the second object cannot be modified by users of the first file" as recited in claim 1.

To: Examiner Michael Pham
Fax: 571-273-3924
From: Andrew Lee (Reg. No. 60,371), 650-324-6351

February 7, 2008
Page 3

- c) Further, even *assuming arguendo* that the private keys of Benson may be construed as reading on the private attributes of claim 1, nowhere does Benson teach or suggest that the private keys corresponding to a data object are actually included in the data object. Col. 5, lines 3-5 state that a public key is then included in each digital signature so that the digital signature may be verified and the authenticity of a data object may be established. Thus, at best, Benson merely discloses that a public key is included in a data object. Benson does not indicate a private key is also included.
- d) Accordingly, Benson also fails to teach or suggest "the specification of the second object including information identifying . . . a plurality of private attributes of the second object" as recited in claim 1.